

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPONENT	GEORGIA	KENTUCKY PROPOSAL	COMMENTS
Tier 1 metrics and penalties.	Incent performance to individual CLECs. Remedies paid to CLEC	Same	
Tier 2 metrics and penalties	Incent performance to CLEC industry. Remedies paid to Commission or designee.	Same	
Tier 1 and Tier 2 penalty calculations are based on:	Per transaction	Same	
Fee schedule for each transaction for Tier 1 and Tier 2	Higher penalties for more critical measurements. Monthly penalties escalate over time for repeat failures.	Same	
Schedule for posting data and reports related to SEEM.	Preliminary SEEM reports will be posted on by 8:00 A.M. EST on the last day of each month or the first business day after the last day of the month for the previous month's performance. Final validated SEEM reports will be posted on the 15th of the month, following the final validated SQM report.	Same	
Penalties for late or incomplete reports?	Yes	Same	
Cap on overall liability	Yes. 44% of Net Revenue	Yes. 36% of Net Revenue.	KY's proposed of cap at 36% of Net Revenue is consistent with all states approved by FCC for Long Distance authority.
Provisions for audits?	Yes	Same	

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPONENT	GEORGIA	KENTUCKY PROPOSAL	COMMENTS
Statistical Methodology for comparisons of CLEC vs. Retail performance.	Truncated Z with Balancing Critical value. Transactions are compared at low (cell) level where characteristics between CLEC and retail are similar.	Same	
Parameter Delta Value for use in statistical comparisons of CLEC vs. Retail performance	0.5 for Tier 1 0.35 for Tier 2	1.0 for Tier 1 0.5 for Tier 2	Delta is a parameter that is related to ‘materiality.’ BellSouth’s proposed delta of 1.0 for Tier1 would result in differences of ½ standard deviation as being material. The values recommended for KY are consistent with the LA PSC’s Commission order, which followed nearly 2 years of proceedings and workshops related to performance measurements and enforcement.
Market Penetration adjustment for low volumes of advanced and nascent services?	Yes	No	Not proposed for KY. The market penetration adjustment is an additional penalty, over and above Tier 1 and Tier 2, that would increase the level of penalties for no other reason than the CLECs have market share below a pre-determined arbitrary level. So, if CLECs choose not to enter the market or compete vigorously for any reason, BellSouth would have to pay higher penalties.
Provisions for accruing interest on payments past the due date?	Yes	Same	
Provisions for dispute resolution	Yes	Same	
Measurements in the plan	See the table below.	See the table below	

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
1. Average Response Time – Pre-Ordering/Ordering		X		Parity + 2 seconds	Same	Same	N/A	Different standard: Parity + 4 seconds	BellSouth proposes a standard of parity + 4 seconds for OSS response interval. This standard is consistent with rulings by the FCC in the orders granting New York and Texas InterLATA authority. The FCC found the additional 4 seconds to be reasonable for firewall security.	
2. Interface Availability – Pre-Ordering/Ordering		X		= 99.5 %	Same	Same	N/A	Same		
3. Interface Availability – Maintenance & Repair		X		= 99.5 %	Same	Same	N/A	Same		
4. Loop Makeup – Response Time – Manual	X	X		95 % within 3 Business days	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Not proposed as a part of Tier 1 because a failure in this process would affect all CLECs. Therefore Tier 2 is appropriate incentive.	Not Available
5. Loop Makeup – Response Time – Electronic	X	X		95 % within 1 minute	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Different standard: 90 % within 5 minutes (reassess in 6 months-new system)	Tier 1 exclusion same as above. Different benchmark is proposed because 1 minute response time is stringent, particularly when applied to new system.	Not Available

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
6. Acknowledgement Message Timeliness – EDI	X	X		95 % within 30 minutes	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	The systems that provide an acknowledgement message to CLECs are regional in nature. Particularly, a failure in this process would affect all CLECs. Therefore, this measure is not proposed for Tier 1, but instead is proposed for Tier 2 only.	Not Available
7. Acknowledgement Message Timeliness – TAG	X	X		95 % within 30 minutes	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Same as above.	Not Available
8. Acknowledgement Message Completeness EDI	X	X		100 %	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Same as above.	Not Available
9. Acknowledgement Message Completeness TAG	X	X		100 %	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Same as above.	Not Available
10. Percent Flow-through Service Requests (Summary)	X	X		Residence - 95% Business - 90% UNE - 85% LNP - 85%	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same except LNP not included in disaggregation	Same as above.	Not Available

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
11. Reject Interval	X	X		<u>Fully Mechanized</u> - 97% = 1 hour <u>Part. Mechanized</u> - 85% = 10 hours <u>Non-Mechanized</u> - 85% = 24 hours	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Only Fully Mechanized method of submission is included: Standard is 95% = 1 hour	Same as above for exclusion of Tier 1. Benchmark for Tier 1 is at 95% due to fact that 97% is a benchmark requiring near-perfection. The SEEM plan proposed for Kentucky only uses the fully mechanized method of submission. This is where the preponderance of CLEC activity occurs, about 75%. Also, partially mechanized and non-mechanized methods of submission are subject to gaming by the CLECs. LSRs can effectively be submitted with known errors in such a way as to guarantee a penalty payment.	Not Available

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
12. Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness	X	X		<u>Fully Mechanized</u> 95% = 3hours <u>Part. Mechanized</u> 85% = 10hours <u>Non-Mechanized</u> 85% = 36 hours <u>IC Trunks</u> 95 % = 10days	Not Proposed	Same	N/A	Only Fully Mechanized method of submission is included: Standard for Fully mechanized is the same 95% = 3hours	Same Comments as above for exclusion form Tier 1 and use of the fully mechanized method of submission only in SEEM.	0.0
13. Firm Order Confirmation and Reject Response Completeness – Fully Mechanized	X	X		95 % returned	Not Proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Same reason for exclusion form Tier 1 as above.	0.0
14. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – Resale POTS	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		1.7
15. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – Resale Design	X	X	X	Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.1
16. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		1.2

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
17. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – UNE Loops	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
18. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – UNE xDSL	X	X	X	ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
19. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – UNE Line Sharing	X	X	X	ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.4
20. Percent Missed Installation Appointments – Local IC Trunks	X	X	X	Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
21. Average Completion Interval – Resale POTS	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		157.4
22. Average Completion Interval – Resale Design	X	X	X	Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.1
23. Average Completion Interval – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.8
24. Average Completion Interval – UNE Loops	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		15.7

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
25. Average Completion Interval – UNE xDSL	X	X	X	- 7 Days w/o Conditioning -14 Days w/ Conditioning	Same	Same	N/A	Different standard: based on <u>ADSL provided to Retail</u>	Since BellSouth has a comparable service, a retail analog is proposed for this measure in Kentucky rather than the benchmarks used in Georgia. Parity can be more appropriately determined by comparing UNE xDSL service to ADSL provided to retail.	0.4
26. Average Completion Interval – UNE Line Sharing	X	X	X	ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.8
27. Average Completion Interval – Local IC Trunks	X	X	X	Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.8
28. Coordinated Customer Conversions Interval – Unbundled Loops	X	X		95% = 15 Minutes	Same	Same	N/A	Same		Not Available
29. Coordinated Customer Conversions – Hot Cut Timeliness % within interval - UNE Loops	X	X		95% within + or – 15 minutes of scheduled start time	Same	Same	N/A	Same standard except for IDLC. <u>IDLC</u> 95% within 4 -hour window	Where the end user is served by Integrated Digital Loop Carrier, three technicians, are involved: the CLEC, BellSouth Central Office tech and BellSouth field tech who must convert the line. This additional coordination requires more flexibility in time schedule.	Not Available

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
30. Coordinated Customer Conversions – % Provisioning Troubles Received within 7 days of a completed service order – UNE Loops	X	X		= 5%	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.4
31. Cooperative Acceptance Testing - % xDSL Loops Tested	X	X		95% of Lines Tested	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Not proposed as a part of Tier 1 because a failure in this process would affect all CLECs. Therefore Tier 2 is the appropriate incentive.	Not Available
32. % Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – Resale POTS	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		3.4
33. % Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – Resale Design	X	X		Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
34. % Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		1.3

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
35. % Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – UNE Loops	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		2.4
36. % Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – UNE xDSL	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
37. Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – UNE Line Sharing	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
38. % Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion – Local IC Trunks	X	X		Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.1
39. LNP – Percent Missed Installation Appointments	X	X		95% Due Dates Met	Same	Same	N/A	Same		Not Available

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
40. LNP – Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval	X	X		95% within 15 minutes	Not proposed	Not proposed	N/A	N/A	This measurement is not an indicator of LNP Disconnect Timeliness Interval as it affects the CLEC and the customer. Mainly, BellSouth can provide a high level of service to CLECs and their customers, yet BellSouth would be assessed large penalties. This result is inconsistent with an enforcement plan’s purpose. BellSouth filed a Motion to Modify with the GPSC indicating that this metric is inadequately defined and proposing several alternative metrics to either augment or replace the existing one. Therefore, BellSouth does not propose this measure for Tier 1 or Tier 2 in Kentucky. Note: Payments have been suspended in Georgia after May.	Not Available
41. Missed Repair Appointments – Resale POTS	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		2.3
42. Missed Repair Appointments – Resale Design	X	X	X	Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.1
43. Missed Repair Appointments – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		4.0

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
44. Missed Repair Appointments – UNE Loops	X	X	X	Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.9
45. Missed Repair Appointments – UNE xDSL	X	X	X	ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
46. Missed Repair Appointments – UNE Line Sharing	X	X	X	ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
47. Missed Repair Appointments – Local IC Trunks	X	X	X	Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
48. Customer Trouble Report Rate – Resale POTS	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		12.0
49. Customer Trouble Report Rate – Resale Design	X	X		Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		2.0
50. Customer Trouble Report Rate – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		12.7
51. Customer Trouble Report Rate – UNE Loops	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		12.0
52. Customer Trouble Report Rate – UNE xDSL	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		10.2
53. Customer Trouble Report Rate – UNE Line Sharing	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		3.2
54. Customer Trouble Report Rate – Local IC Trunks	X	X		Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
55. Maintenance Average Duration – Resale POTS	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		1.7
56. Maintenance Average Duration – Resale Design	X	X		Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.9
57. Maintenance Average Duration – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.4
58. Maintenance Average Duration – UNE Loops	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		1.6
59. Maintenance Average Duration – UNE xDSL	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
60. Maintenance Average Duration – UNE Line Sharing	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
61. Maintenance Average Duration – Local IC Trunks	X	X		Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
62. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – Resale POTS	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. (POTS)	Same	Same	N/A	Same		3.8
63. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – Resale Design	X	X		Retail Design	Same	Same	N/A	Same		1.1
64. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – UNE Loop and Port Combinations	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus.	Same	Same	N/A	Same		4.9
65. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – UNE Loops	X	X		Retail Res. & Bus. Dispatch	Same	Same	N/A	Same		2.9

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Attachment I

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
66. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – UNE xDSL	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
67. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – UNE Line Sharing	X	X		ADSL provided to Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
68. % Repeat Troubles within 30 days – Local IC Trunks	X	X		Parity with Retail	Same	Same	N/A	Same		0.0
69. Invoice Accuracy	X	X	X	Parity with Retail	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Not proposed as a part of Tier 1 because a failure in this process would affect all CLECs. Therefore Tier 2 is appropriate incentive.	0.0
70. Mean Time to Deliver Invoices	X	X	X	Parity with Retail	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Same as above.	0.0
71. Usage Data Delivery Accuracy	X	X		Parity with Retail	Not proposed	Same	N/A	Same	Same as above.	0.0

SEEM COMPARISON- KENTUCKY PROPOSAL AND GEORGIA

Differences are identified and reasons for differences are briefly discussed

COMPARISON OF MEASUREMENTS

MEASUREMENT	GEORGIA				KENTUCKY				COMMENTS	KENTUCKY TIER 1 SEEM (\$000) May – July (Note 2)
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Standard	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3 (Note 1)	Standard		
72. Trunk Group Performance – Aggregate	X	X	X	Any 2 hour period where CLEC Blockage exceeds BellSouth Blockage by more than 0.5% using trunk groups 1,3,4,5,10,16 for CLECs and 9 for BellSouth	Same	Same	N/A	Same		Not Available
73. Collocation Percent of Due Dates Missed	X	X	X	= 95% on time	Same	Same	N/A	Same		Not Available
74. Timeliness of Change Management Notices		X	X	95% = 30 days of Release	Same	Same	N/A	Same		
75. Timeliness of Documents Associated with Change		X	X	95% = 30 days of the Change	Same	Same	N/A	Same		
TOTAL SEEM Penalties for May Through July – Kentucky Pro Forma										263.1

NOTE 1: Tier 3 is not proposed in the Kentucky SEEM Plan.

NOTE 2: Data for measures where the standard is a benchmark are not currently available for Kentucky. Only pro forma penalties for measures with retail analogs are provided.